UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2620th MEETING: 10 OCTOBER 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2620)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The Middle East problem including the Palestinian question:	
Letter dated 30 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17507)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2620th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 10 October 1985, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Vernon A. WALTERS
(United States of America).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2620)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The Middle East problem including the Palestinian question:
   Letter dated 30 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17507).

The meeting was called to order at 4.15 p.m.

Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The Middle East problem including the Palestinian question:
Letter dated 30 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17507).

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2619th meeting, I invite the observer for the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Israel, Kuwait and the Syrian Arab Republic to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Qaddoumi (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Netanyahu (Israel), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait) and Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Algeria, Czechoslovakia, Morocco, Pakistan and Yugoslavia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Djoudi (Algeria), Mr. César (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Alaoui (Morocco), Mr. Yaqub-Khan (Pakistan) and Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 10 October from the permanent representative of Kuwait [*S/17558*], which reads as follows:

> "In my capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States for the month of October, I have the honour to request that during the Council's discussion of the item presently on its agenda the Security Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Observer of the League of Arab States."

4. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to accede to that request.

It was so decided.

5. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is Mr. Massamba Sarré, Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

6. Mr. SARRÉ, Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, I thank all the members of the Council for having authorized me to participate once again in the debate on the situation in the Middle East.

7. As was emphasized this morning [*2619th meeting*], the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Luanda from 4 to 7 September, wanted such a meeting to be held. They wished in that way first to draw the attention of the international community, and especially of the Council, once again to the urgent need to restore peace to the Middle East, for the benefit of all the States and peoples of the region.

8. When speaking before the Council as representative of Senegal during the debate on the complaint by Tunisia last week [*2611th meeting*], I stressed that the fundamental reason for the cycles of violence we are witnessing in the Middle East was the fact that the question of the Middle East, and especially the question of Palestine, had not been resolved. In the light of the most recent events in the Mediterranean, which we condemn, it is important to stress once again that the question of Palestine, which is at the heart of the Israeli-Arab conflict, deserves constant and continuing attention, with a view to arriving at a just and lasting solution.

9. In that respect, the United Nations, through the Security Council, unquestionably has the responsibility for ensuring recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, to independence, to national sovereignty, to return, to recover its property, and to physical protection and decent living conditions in the refugee camps.

10. Since its establishment the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People has, in accordance with its mandate, endeavoured to make recommendations that can allow the Palestinian people to exercise its inalienable rights as recognized and defined by the General Assembly.

11. The recommendations contained in the Committee's first report, in 1976, and maintained without change since then, have been ever more firmly endorsed every year by the General Assembly. As members are aware, in spite of the repeated requests it received from the Committee, the Council has not yet followed those recommendations, nor has it implemented them. Those recommendations are too familiar to the Council for me to repeat them here. I should just like to recall that they are solidly based on internationally recognized fundamental principles. The Committee remains convinced that if the Council were to adopt positive measures to implement those recommendations, then the possibility of the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East would be increased.

12. Since 1983 the Committee has also made further efforts to promote implementation of the recommendations adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, *inter alia*, the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, as endorsed by the General Assembly, by an overwhelming majority, in its resolutions 38/58 C of 13 December 1983 and 39/49 D of 11 December 1984.

13. It will be recalled that in this quest for peace the General Assembly invited the Council to carry out all the appropriate provisions and steps for the holding of that conference. That invitation includes both a legal and a political aspect. I say legal because the question of the Middle East has always been within the purview of the United Nations, and political because the United Nations must seek political solutions to situations that endanger international peace and security.

14. It may be appropriate to recall here the guiding principles of that conference, which in our view offer all the interested parties, and above all the parties concerned, extensive possibilities for participation in the negotiations, and represent an intelligent and practical way of at last giving concrete shape to the concept of a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

15. These principles, established in resolution 38/58 C, are, *inter alia*, first, the attainment by the Palestinian people of its legitimate inalienable rights, including the right to return, the right to self-determination and the right to establish its own independent State in Palestine; secondly, the right of the PLO, the representative of the Palestinian people, to participate on an equal footing with other parties in all efforts, deliberations and conferences on the Middle East; thirdly, the need to put an end to Israel's occupation of the Arab territories, in accordance with the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, and, consequently, the need to secure Israel's withdrawal from the territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem; and, fourthly, the right of all States in the region to existence within secure and internationally recognized boundaries, with justice and security for all the people, the *sine qua non* of which is the recognition and attainment of the legitimate, inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

16. The General Assembly therefore invited all parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict, including the PLO, as well as the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the other members of the Security Council and other States concerned to participate in an international peace conference on the Middle East, on an equal footing and with equal rights. In our view such a conference would in not in any way be a public relations exercise but rather an objective and practical step that would undoubtedly facilitate the search for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

17. It should be clear that only the United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, which has responsibility for the organization of the conference, can provide a legal and political framework acceptable to the vast majority of the international community so that negotiations could take place with respect for universally recognized international principles and on an equal footing for all parties concerned.

18. The first elements of that conference already exist. I might mention just the recommendations of the Committee, the Fez Arab plan, the Jordanian-Palestinian plan and other approaches.

19. An international conference under the auspices of the United Nations would make it possible to go beyond narrow strategic interests and the purely internal concerns of the different States and to arrive at a just and comprehensive peace. The agreements reached at such a conference would be universally valid and could be guaranteed and applied equitably by all the parties concerned.

20. Therefore, as the Council is aware, in its programme of work for 1985 the Committee gave absolute priority to the convening of that conference; it sent delegations to the capitals of member States of the Council and stressed the urgent need to convene the conference without delay, emphasizing the primary role that should be played by the Council.

21. The Committee was greatly encouraged by the positive reaction of the Governments it visited, by their understanding of the urgent need to take practical measures, and above all by their determination to contribute actively to that end. The Committee was also encouraged by the growing acceptance of the idea of the conference which emerged at various seminars and symposia held in 1985, and by the work undertaken with that aim in mind by many non-governmental organizations in a number of countries.

22. We were also pleased to note the positive responses given by the majority of the members of the Council and other parties concerned to the contacts made by the Secretary-General, though we do regret the reservations of certain States. On behalf of the Committee we thank the Secretary-General for his efforts, and we note that he will continue to follow the question closely and keep Member States informed of any new developments that arise.

23. In conclusion I should like to stress that the recommendations of the Committee and those of the Geneva Conference have been given international support. They were prepared very objectively and are consistent with all earlier decisions of the United Nations on this question. But the recommendations go beyond those prior decisions because they contain a comprehensive formula for a just and peaceful solution.

24. As I said a moment ago, there has as yet, for different reasons, been no follow-up to those recommendations. The main reason is that the positions taken by the protagonists often make it difficult for agreement to be reached on principles. None the less they do constitute a solid basis for a peaceful solution to the Israeli-Arab crisis.

25. It is clearly necessary to approach the problem with renewed determination. It is essential to take measures to start the peace process that will lead to that solution. That is the objective of the conference called for in General Assembly resolution 38/58 C. The Committee believes that that conference will make important progress, and it requests the co-operation of all the parties concerned in order to ensure its success in the common interest.

26. On behalf of the Committee I should like once again to address an urgent appeal to the members of the Council not to miss this historic opportunity. In particular, we invite those who still have doubts or reservations or who have rejected the idea to reconsider their position and to work more constructively for the convening and the success of an international peace conference on the Middle East. The Council can, by means of action based on legitimate authority and respect for the common interests of mankind, and with the appropriate political will, establish peace in the region and save mankind from the danger of a much vaster conflagration.

27. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Israel. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

28. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): I have just spoken to the Klinghoffer family. I called to express my condolences. I did not tell them what has been said here—and I suppose in a few other forums: that "we do not even know if Mr. Klinghoffer was killed"; "we have not seen the body"; and other such things. I did not tell them that because they know the tragic fact all too well. And the tragic fact is that Mr. Klinghoffer, who was 69 years old, confined to a wheelchair, taking special medication, used the savings that he and his wife had accumulated to go on a cruise in the Mediterranean. They were seized, like the rest of the passengers on the ship, by the terrorists. But they were singled out from the rest of the passengers on the ship—and for one reason: because they were Jewish. And so Mr. Klinghoffer was killed—brutally killed, as the captain of the ship testified—and his frail, 69-year-old body, which had been battered by many things, now received the final battering by being tossed overboard.

29. Mr. Klinghoffer is not going to go away; his body is not going to go away; and his killers are not going to be able to make it go away—not from this discussion or from any other discussion.

30. If this Council were to act responsibly, it would address itself immediately not only to this latest manifestation of terrorism, but to this fresh and new manifestation of piracy, piracy and terror on the high seas, which affects every one of the countries represented here, either directly or indirectly. So I propose to discuss this subject in the first part of my remarks.

31. Yasser Arafat says that he does not know anything about this; he does not know who these killers are. He says that he simply tried to mediate this unfortunate crisis in the best fashion.

32. I have just received a very detailed report from our intelligence services. I assume it is now being distributed to a number of similar services and to Governments that are represented in this chamber. The facts show without a shadow of a doubt that the hijacking of the Italian cruise liner *Achille Lauro* on 7 October was carried out by the Abu Abbas faction of the PLO's Palestine Liberation Front (PLF). It was carried out with the full prior knowledge and approval of the PLO Chairman. Mr. Arafat's subsequent protestations that he had nothing to do with this and his attempt at "benevolent intermediacy" were simply a cover-up for his own role and for the failure of the mission.

33. Now, who is Abu Abbas in the first place? We are talking about a faction of the PLO under this man, who is a member of the Executive Committee of the PLO and is a loyalist—a staunch loyalist—of Arafat. He has been financed by Arafat. His operations are fully co-ordinated with the Fatah, and he is based in Tunis.

34. This group has several operations to its credit. The murder of the Haran family in Nahariya in 1978 is one of them. It may be recalled that in that particular instance the terrorist in question, Mr. Kuntary—who is now in an Israeli gaol—after killing the husband, took the five-year-old daughter and bashed her brains out on a rock. Mr. Kuntary was called by the PLO terrorists a "hero", and his was the first name that they gave on the list of terrorists to be released.

35. The *Achille Lauro* operation was not planned originally as a hijacking. The four PLF men were to have travelled on the *Achille Lauro* to the Israeli port of Ashdod. They were supposed to have disembarked there and to have staged there a hostage-taking and then to demand the release of the Fatah terrorists being held in Israeli jails—and, as I said, the first name they had on the list was that of Mr. Kuntary. They had other objectives as well. Among the names that they gave were Force 17 members.

36. Over the past six months or so, I have submitted letters to the Council describing various attempts by the PLO to launch sea-borne attacks to try to stage hostage-taking, either on the seas or in Israel itself or through Lebanon. The aim was to seize hostages in order to obtain the release of these people. This latest manifestation was intended as another—admittedly more brazen—attempt in that same line. But something went wrong. It did not quite work out as planned. And it went wrong when the ship was still in Egyptian waters. The terrorists had embarked on the ship disguised as innocent passengers. They had taken accommodations; they had smuggled in their weapons. They were going to wait until the ship had reached Ashdod. But they were discovered.

37. At that point, they had a decision to make, because they realized that, first, contrary to their plans they were not going to make it to Ashdod and, secondly, there were no Israelis aboard. That was fortuitous. My parents were on this very boat approximately a year ago, and there were then many, many Israelis on that boat, several hundred in fact. This ready prey, these pensioners—my parents are a couple in their seventies, and from their evidence most of the people who were with them were in either their fifties, sixties or seventies, like Mr. Klinghoffer—were not available, so a change of plans ensued.

38. The hijackers hijacked the ship at that point and placed their demands then and there. They demanded the release of the 50 Palestinian Arab terrorists held in Israel, and they then proceeded to shoot Mr. Klinghoffer. What followed was therefore another mishap, because you can have sudden changes of plan in a terrorist operation, but you cannot plan to have all the Governments concerned refuse to accept the ship and refuse to negotiate with the ship. This was another miscalculation on the part of the terrorists and another unexpected development for them. At this point it became apparent to the PLO command and to the terrorists themselves that the entire operation had misfired. Now, the only thing to do was to extricate themselves from this mess.

39. This is the point at which Arafat appears on the scene openly, this time in the guise of a mediator ready to do his utmost to bring the episode to a happy conclusion. His second-in-command, Abu Iyad, announces on 9 October, with the confidence born of perfect knowledge, that the incident would be over "in a matter of hours". And so it was. From Port Said, Arafat, acting through one Abu Khalid—who we believe was a code name for Abu Abbas whom he had summoned to Egypt—ordered the hijackers to bring the ship back to Egypt and to give themselves up to the Egyptian authorities. They promptly complied.

40. He continues, of course, to claim that he had known nothing of the planned operation, that he had no "control" of the group that carried it out. That is a blatant lie. Al Fatah and Arafat have been planning for some time now to strike at Israel's ports of Haifa, Ashdod and Elat using vessels hired for this purpose, but the Israeli Coast Guard has foiled them. The Abu Abbas operation involved a spin-off of this series of earlier attempts, but the plan to carry out a spectacular hostage-taking operation at Ashdod had to be abandoned when the group's presence was discovered, as I said, on the voyage.

41. Those are the facts of the situation. The attempts of the PLO here and elsewhere to deflect world attention from its own unspeakable crimes are reinforced by the introduction of an age-old technique they have been using: with one arm they kill and kidnap, while with the other arm they deny. This is very useful, because if you have the blood of Mr. Klinghoffer and other victims on your hands, you deny it. You can say, "My hands are not stained with this blood." And if you have a situation where your demands are not met, as was the case here, then you can always intercede as the mediator and help to resolve the crisis. This is like the Godfather calling off his henchmen to stop a crime that he himself engineered. That is precisely what we have here.

42. I do not think any of the representatives here are patsies; I do not think the world is a patsy; I do not think anybody is going to believe it. But it is not a question of what I think, it is a question of what I know: I know that this information is now being shared by many Governments, and I would say that it will come out in the media and in formal exchanges and be common knowledge within 24 hours, possibly less.

43. I said that this is an age-old technique, and I would remind the Council that we have had many, many killings by the PLO in which they have denied culpability. For example, for years we had the shadowy, mysterious organization known as Black September. Black September

perpetrated the Munich massacre and committed many other atrocities familiar to us all. It blew up, for example, the airplanes at Zarka and elsewhere, and Arafat constantly said "This is not us. This is a shadowy group. We know nothing about it." But the PLO's own statements in ensuing years openly admitted that Black September—as everyone knows by now—was a wholly owned subsidiary of the PLO directly responsible and reporting directly to Yasir Arafat. I do not, therefore, think there is anything new under the sun, and I think that people chuckle when they hear Yasir Arafat say, as he did the other night, that the PLO is against any terrorism. That is like Jack the Ripper saying he is against murder. We all know better.

44. It has also been asked: why would they do such a thing? Why would they perpetrate these crimes, why would they kill Mr. Klinghoffer? For the same reason that Kuntary bashed the head of Enat Haran, for the same reason that PLO terrorists murdered a baby in its crib in Kibbutz Misgavam, for the same reason that they kill their own people. Why did they kill Issam Sartawit? Why did they kill the Imam Huzandar—a religious leader—and hundreds of other Arabs? Why did they kill with such glee the Prime Minister of Jordan, Wasfi Tall, and bent to the ground and drank his blood? You all remember that scene, I am sure. Why did they all dance in the street when Sadat was killed? Why did they kill the three tourists in Larnaca? Why did they take that poor, middle-aged woman, shoot her in the back of the head and leave her body to twist in the wind for 10 hours on the rail of that boat? Why did they do it? Because it is a way of life for them. This is what they are all about: they are terrorists, they are murderers, they are killers, and for them there is no compunction, there is no shock, there is no horror, there is no restraint, there are no inhibitions. For them to question why does not even arise: it is natural. I suspect they also enjoy it.

45. This is the incident we should be dealing with right now, this and the hundreds of other lesser-known incidents of terrorism. This is what the Security Council should do right now: it should discuss how to stop these killers, how to arrest the disease of terrorism, how to hit the terror factories that spread this virus around the world, how to deal with the States that give them support—because I think we are talking here about three basic categories of States, and everyone here falls into one of those categories. There are States that oppose terrorism, and we know who they are. There are States that promote terrorism, and we know who they are. And there are States that assume a neutral position. In the question of terrorism there is no neutrality. There is no position of magisterial objectivity between good and evil. You have to choose: you are either with the terrorists or you are against them, and if you are against them, if you are committed to fight terrorism, then you side with the countries that fight terrorism, and that means that you do not give terrorists safe passage, that you extradite them or you prosecute them, that you do not give them a helping hand and that you make every effort to hinder them, not facilitate their activities. As for the countries that support terrorism, it is up to the community of nations to organize the political and economic and, if necessary, military measures that have to be taken jointly against these outlaw States.

46. I was very glad to hear and read the forceful statement that came out of the Council yesterday [*2618th meeting*]. But I would suggest and urge that the Council proceed to the next step and engage right now in a concrete discussion of the steps that are necessary.

47. You notice, Mr. President, that I have not been sitting at the Council table. I was sitting in the back. That was not by accident. I deliberately chose not to sit at the table to express the feeling that this meeting is irrelevant and unwarranted—I do not mean only because of what I have just been talking about, that is, the failure to address the immediate problem of terrorism and piracy. I am talking about what it is convened for, what its stated purpose is. It is meant to be another kangaroo court in which Israel is to be brought in, to be hung, drawn and quartered and then, in the form of the international conference which is presumably supposed to be the issue of this meeting, to be given an unfair trial to boot.

48. We are not going to play this game. We are not going to agree to a conference and we are not going to enter into this discussion—unless there is a real desire on the part of some representatives here to discuss the situation in the Middle East. By all means, let us discuss the situation in the Middle East.

49. I have here eight pages, which I have abbreviated, that deal with the immediate, burning aspects of the situation in the Middle East: the killings in Lebanon, Tripoli and elsewhere; what is happening in the Iran-Iraq war, which is escalating; and the recent clashes between Libya and Tunisia. That is just a small sample of what has been happening in the past two weeks.

50. I have noticed your admirable penchant for brevity and for punctuality, Mr. President, and I know that you would wish to end this meeting at the appointed time. I shall therefore save this material for the eventuality that perhaps this meeting will indeed discuss the situation in the Middle East.

51. I should like, however, to give a sample of what I am talking about—this is just a one page sample. And I should like simply to indicate a few of the sparks of the larger flame that is engulfing the Middle East from the Persian Gulf to the Sahara. On 15 January of this year, a huge blast was reported in central Damascus. On March 21, the Jordanian Airline offices at Athens, Rome and Nicosia were attacked; on 3 April, bazooka attacks against the Jordanian Embassy at Rome; on 4 April, bazooka attacks against Jordanian Airline at Athens. On 12 April, a restaurant at Madrid was bombed. Islamic Jihad claimed responsibility for the attack. In mid-May, an explosion occurred at Riyad. Iraq is accused by various sources because of its displeasure at Prince Saud's visit to Iran. On 29 May, a car belonging to a Syrian diplomat stationed in Morocco blows up in front of the

Syrian Ambassador's residence. On 9 June, Syria recalls its Ambassador to Kuwait in light of Kuwait's deportation of Syrians in Kuwait. In mid-June, a car booby-trapped by Syria is dismantled on the Iraqi border. On 26 June, Iraq breaks diplomatic relations with Libya. On 4 July, the Jordanian Airline offices at Madrid are bombed. Guess who claims responsibility? Black September, back on the scene. On 10 July, Morocco foils an Algerian-sponsored sabotage operation by arresting a group of terrorists on its border. On 11 July, explosives rock two cafes in Kuwait. That same day, buses explode at Tehran. On 17 July, Syrian military aircraft violated Iraqi air space. On 21 July, a huge blast is reported at central Tehran. On 30 July, an explosion occurs at central Damascus.

52. We have more, more, more, more. I could spend the rest of the afternoon reading but I am not going to do that, because the point is that the Council has every right, every duty and every obligation under its mandate to discuss these outbreaks of violence and to address these issues, but it has no right to confine the discussion to just one of the disputes in the Middle East—one that itself derives from the broader tendencies of several extremist Arab régimes and groups to plunge the region into violence, bloodshed and terror. Until the Council acts responsibly and devotes attention to the real situation in the Middle East, I will, with your permission, Mr. President, resume my seat away from the Council table and watch this spectacle of the absurd from the sidelines.

53. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

54. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I shall confine myself to the agenda that we have before us. The Council is now considering the Middle East problem including the Palestinian question, which is the essence thereof. The situation is developing in an unprecedented manner in our region. This is due to Israel's persistence in escalating its policy of aggression and terrorism against the Arab people.

55. The gravity of the situation is nothing new. It is the inevitable result of the development and evolution of the expansionist and aggressive nature of zionism. Since the founding of Israel, this aggression has constantly increased and developed, along with Israel's expansion, and Israel has also become more greedy for Arab land and more thirsty for Arab blood. Ever since zionism found a foothold for settlers in Arab Palestine in 1917 and since the racist settler colonialist State was set up in 1948, it has, through force, violence and terrorism, dispersed inhabitants, annexed lands and seized Arab property. Israel's dossier is fraught with such practices. It has unleashed wars of aggression against Arabs, such as the 1948 war against the Palestinian people. Then there was the 1956 war against Egypt and thereafter the 1967 aggression against Syria, Jordan and Egypt and the war of 1982 against Lebanon. This was all part of the plan to establish Greater Israel. In all these wars of aggression, Israel was supported by imperialist world forces, led by the United States of America.

56. Never has Israel attempted to conceal its expansionist designs, although it has pretended to advocate peace. But its "peace" amounts to a short period of truce during which it can digest the fruits of its unceasing aggression. It always retains what it calls its option to commit further acts of aggression in the name of religion, race or history. But it believes in no religion; it possesses no human values; it has no history apart from a falsified history as prewritten by the theoreticians of zionism in an attempt to establish a forged birth certificate for a nation. Zionism is a colonialist movement that arose with the European colonialist expansionist movement: It is but the other side of the coin. Its doctrine, ideology and methods were contemporary with those adopted during the nineteenth century by Europe in the third world.

57. Since its establishment, Israel, despite its false pretentions to peace, has always rejected true peace efforts. As far as Israel is concerned, peace is the *status quo* it has established by force of arms after each of the wars it has unleashed. Then it calls for peace again, on the basis of the gains of the last war.

58. Israel's acquiring territory by force, driving the indigenous population out of that territory and replacing it with foreign settlers represent the main tenets of Zionist ideology. Were it not for this sanguinary and racist ideology as well as the brutal Israeli practices in application of this ideology, there would be no crisis or threat to international peace in the Middle East.

59. Like all racist and colonialist entities, Israel has tried to crush the Arabs and to deprive them of their human rights. It has threatened their very national survival and civilization. Force is the method of Israel. The "pure" racist community is the highest value in the crumbling scale of distorted Zionist values, in utter contradiction with human values and universal morality. In order to try to justify taking over the lands of Palestine and the surrounding territories, zionism has invented the myth of what it calls "God's chosen people" and "the Promised Land". The annexation of Jerusalem was intended quite simply to eradicate one of the most important features of Islamic and Christian civilization: the "pure" Jewish State must be purely Jewish in matters pertaining to life and religion. The annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights too was a prelude to subsequent expansionist measures.

60. As Israel calls for peace, it increases its expansion to the detriment of our land and our people. After it has occupied the whole of Palestine and the Syrian Golan Heights, Israel is now occupying parts of southern Lebanon, its so-called security belt which has actually become—we bless this fact—a belt of death for the invaders and their agents. The sole purpose of this belt is to impose a new *fait accompli* in order to control the watersheds in the southern part of this Arab country, whose economic, social and cultural infrastructure Israel completely destroyed in its despicable, barbarous war there, a war which was condemned by the whole world.

61. Thus the Middle East crisis is a struggle between a racist sectarian settler group and an Arab, Islamic and

Christian civilization with a universal orientation that flows into the mainstream of world civilization. History testifies to the contribution of the Arabs in the building of this civilization for the benefit of all mankind. It is therefore a struggle of destinies, threatening all aspects of Arab existence in the areas now occupied by Israel or those which it plans to occupy. Indeed, it is a struggle of destinies because the Zionist ideology does not recognize an Arab presence at all. Israeli leaders, irrespective of their political affiliation, their parties and their temperaments, persist in saying that Israel has not occupied the West Bank, including Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip or the Golan Heights. They maintain that Israel has "liberated" them. By the end of 1984, Israel had established 41 settlements in the Syrian Golan Heights in the name of liberation, 160 settlements in the West Bank, also in the name of liberation, and 19 in the Gaza Strip under the same pretence. This "liberation" and the displacement of millions of inhabitants from and to the occupied Arab territories are war crimes against the Arabs and the whole of mankind under modern international law and the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[1] in which a body of law was developed and codified after the Second World War to prevent any repetition of Nazi war crimes like those now being committed before us by Israel.

62. The Israelis claim that the Arabs who are defending their land, their homes, their property and their existence are terrorists. And they impose on these inhabitants emergency laws with a view to supressing the heroic resistance which they are waging under occupation to defend their rights. The Israelis forget naturally—and the Western world follows suit—that the right to resist the aggressor is an established human right approved by all laws and that he who does not resist occupation is doomed to destruction. European resistance against the Nazis was not terrorism. Inasmuch as we are equal human beings, resistance to Israeli occupation cannot be considered terrorism, unless we choose to become accomplices in the crime of occupation, aggression and settlement.

63. We see no difference between South Africa and Israel. Both profess the same ideology, which is to eliminate the indigenous inhabitants and deprive those who have survived of their rights. White settlers have seized fertile African lands, plundered their natural resources and divided the area into bantustans, those regional pockets into which they have herded the indigenous inhabitants in order to deprive them of citizenship. They have pushed hundreds of thousands of people into vast concentration camps on the outskirts of the cities and have denied them equality as if they were solely bound to their land through the services they render to the white minority. There is no difference at all between South Africa and Israel. In South Africa, white settlers have taken over African land with the assistance of colonialism and imperialism and have enslaved or driven out the inhabitants or shut them up in ghettoes. In Palestine, settlers were brought in from abroad to expel and disperse the Arabs and to assert supremacy over those remaining by means of occupation. There is no difference between South Africa and Israel. Both subsist by force, violence and terrorism and by enslaving the inhabitants. There is also no difference between Israel and South Africa, since both present a threat and try to impose hegemony on the surrounding States; both serve world imperialism and are served by it in turn. Pretoria is occupying Namibia and maintains a military presence in parts of Angola, while Israel has expanded from the coast to the hills until it has occupied the whole of Palestine and then expanded further into Syria and Lebanon. Both régimes justify their presence under the pretext of a civilizing mission, and both think that they are acting in God's will by accomplishing such a mission.

64. The nature of this struggle makes it imperative for the Arabs to build up their forces, their true solidarity and their unity in order to repel this expansionist invasion which aims at creating the State of "Greater Israel", extending from the Nile to the Euphrates. And Israel could not have achieved its expansion had not the foreign mandatory régimes prepared the ground by breaking up the Arab home into small States. Palestine fell victim to zionism, which was able, through its worldwide influence, to open the door to immigration. The Zionist gangs were armed before the setting up of Israel. Then Israel was armed with all the necessary weapons and provided with full support in such a way as to enable it to consolidate the first stage of its occupation in 1948, when the United States of America, which inherited the position of the British Empire in the Middle East, gave Israel unrestricted military, human and financial support so that Israel could consolidate its expansionist occupation by creating the *fait accompli* which they believe erroneously—I repeat erroneously—to be irreversible. The Arabs still confront today a plan which aims at the following: first, their fragmentation and the prevention of their union and even their true solidarity in order to prevent them from defending themselves against the Zionist expansionist enemy and resisting its military and political plans; secondly, enhancing Israel's capabilities in all fields so that it may keep its territorial gains and extend its hegemony over the whole region.

65. But, in spite of current Arab fragmentation and the increase of the capabilities of Israeli aggression, the Arab people has not ceased to resist, whether in Palestine, the Golan Heights or Lebanon. The Palestinian people, supported by the Arab masses, had confronted the Israeli mass slaughter in 1948, and in 1967 Israel occupied all parts of Palestine together with Sinai and the Golan Heights, and it imagined that in this way it had been able, once and for all, to subdue the Arabs forever and that it had become master of the region. But very quickly it faced the Palestinian resistance in the occupied Palestinian Arab territories and the resistance of the inhabitants of the occupied Syrian Arab Golan Heights. The 1973 war proved that Israel can be defeated through unified Arab action and that the Israeli army is not as invincible as some thought it to be. Israeli's defeat was very near, had not imperialism intervened in its favour, on the one hand, and had not the régime of the biggest Arab country weakened, on the other hand. Lebanese national resistance, which started with the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in June 1982, proved, with all the foreign intervention that accompanied

that war, that it is possible to recover territory and dignity when a people stands united in the struggle against the aggressors. And today there is nobody who does not recognize that Israel and its allies have lost the war in Lebanon, since they were prevented from harvesting the fruits of the aggression of this war, one of which was to be the imposition of submission and hegemony of Lebanon.

66. The whole world recognizes today the right of the Palestinian people to return to its homeland, to exercise its right to self-determination and to establish its independent State on its national territory. It also calls for the complete withdrawal of Israel, after the deep transformations wrought by the glorious October war in the balance of forces. Among these transformations were the conviction of the majority of the world that it was no longer possible to stand silent before the adventures of Israel and that there was a real and dangerous struggle between the Arabs and Israel; that the Middle East crisis directly threatened peace and security in that region; and that this peace and security were an integral part of the peace and security of the world as a whole.

67. But, unfortunately, world imperialism quickly succeeded in undermining the Arab solidarity which had crystalized in the form of positive transformations and new facts following 1973. World imperialism succeeded in finding agents to subdue the will of the Arab masses and deprive them of their freedom, which had made them able to withstand the expansionist enemy. Those agents sided with the capitulationist plan, and the Camp David accords were concluded, to the detriment of the dignity of the Egyptian people, the rights of the struggling Palestinian people and the Arab States that believed in the unity of their nationalism and their destiny and in their capability to withstand the enemy and recover their rights. But Arab Syria rejected the capitulationist deal, which it regarded as a move from the Arab side to the Israeli side. Since that time, Arab Syria, through its resistance, has been shouldering heavy national burdens and it says sincerely that it seeks just, lasting and comprehensive peace. We are not war-loving, we are not lovers of war, and, consequently, we sided with our brethren, the Arab States, in arriving at an Arab peace plan based on unanimity at Fez in 1982 [*see S/15510, annex*]. This plan is based on the withdrawal of Israel from all occupied Arab territories and the restoration to the Arab Palestinian people of its inalienable national rights, including, first and foremost, its right to return to its homeland, its right to self-determination and its right to the establishment of its independent and sovereign State on its national territory. We have also supported the call to convene an international conference under the aegis of the United Nations, in which all the parties to the conflict would participate, together with the two super-Powers, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States. We reiterate that the international conference is our objective. At the same time, we are firmly opposed to all the current attempts to avoid or to circumvent the international conference provided for in General Assembly resolution 38/58 C of 13 December 1983. Syria firmly rejects, as it has done in the past, partial and individual solutions and considers the Amman Agreement, signed on 11 February 1985, and the attempt to win suport for it, to be tantamount to an elimination of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, foremost among which is its right to establish its own independent Palestinian State on its national territory. We repeat what was stated by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic on 1 October 1985 at the general debate of the General Assembly, namely that "the renunciation of an independent Palestinian State would make the concept of self-determination pointless and devoid of meaning".[2]

68. The right to self-determination and the right to establish an independent Palestinian State on national territory constitute the cornerstone of United Nations resolutions relating to the situation in the Middle East and the question of Palestine and the basis of the efforts of the non-aligned countries in their sincere endeavours to bring about a just peace. This was reaffirmed at the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Luanda last September, and at preceding conferences, particularly the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March 1983, in several paragraphs of their concluding statements.

69. A just and lasting peace is not an abstract concept. We cannot allow the enemy and its allies to dictate their conditions to us. The conditions and circumstances required for a just, lasting and comprehensive peace are, primarily, true Arab solidarity and the unity of Arab ranks, which international imperialism is trying to undermine once again by means of proposals that are contrary to the spirit of the Arab Peace Plan, as enshrined in the principles of the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez in 1982, and to United Nations resolutions relating to Palestine and the Middle East.

70. The United States and Israel are not content simply to reject the Fez principles. They have also rejected the invitation to participate in the International Peace Conference on the Middle East, the convening of which was called for by the General Assembly in its resolution 38/58 C. The principal elements of that resolution, which was adopted by 124 votes in favour, and 4 votes against which included the votes of the United States and Israel, were contained in paragraphs 3 and 4.

71. Paragraph 4 invited all parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict, together with the United States and the Soviet Union and other States concerned, to participate in the Conference on the equal footing and with equal rights. The rejection by the United States and Israel of any constructive initiative simply reflects their resolve to pursue a course that serves only their own aggressive interests, to the detriment of the rights of the Arab people of Palestine, the Arab territories and the Arab nation as a whole, and to dismiss the constructive role that the Soviet Union and certain other countries, particularly the non-aligned countries, could play in bringing about peace. It also demonstrates their resolve to ignore all United Nations resolutions relating to the question of Palestine, to exclude the Secretary-General from any peace effort and to deny the

United Nations any role in such an effort. More importantly, it demonstrates their resolve to stamp out the Palestinian Arab national character. Mr. Shultz, the United States Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, described United States policy in the course of his speech at Arlington, Virginia on 21 April 1985, when he talked about the cohesion between American and Israeli interests, thus showing that there is no independent American policy in the Middle East; there is simply an Israeli policy that is carefully and faithfully pursued by the United States. Mr. Shultz said:

> "The history of the Arab-Israeli conflict shows, without question, that movement in the peace process can only come when there is no doubt of our commitment to Israel. It can only come when no one in the Arab world or elsewhere has any delusions about the central reality that America's support for Israel can never be weakened."*

72. In the light of this official statement, how can we say that the United States can plan an independent role in solving the Middle East crisis? Nothing has been published since April to modify or contradict these statements.

73. With regard to separate agreements, the Arabs acting in isolation from each other and the role of the United Nations and its resolutions being disregarded, Mr. Shultz said the following: "The only path to progress, justice, and peace in the Middle East is that of direct negotiations."* In another part of his statement, Mr. Shultz said, in a highly threatening tone dismissive of the interests of the people of Palestine, that if the Arabs did not submit to Israeli demands: "There is no alternative to direct negotiation; the longer this truth is evaded, the longer the Palestinian people are the victim."*

74. There is a threat here: to close every path to peace except that of direct negotiations and to bypass the role of the United Nations, and, if the Arabs do not accept that, then: "the longer the Palestinian people are the victim."* That is to say, a perpetuation of Israeli occupation as long as the Arabs do not submit to Israel's will. That is detrimental to the Arabs and deprives the United States role of any credibility.

75. As for the United States rejection of international law, which recognizes the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and the establishment of an independent Palestinian State, Mr. Shultz said in his statement: "We will not support the establishment of an independent Palestinian State in the West Bank and Gaza".* Permit me to say, on this point, that it is as if the Palestinian people's right to self-determination was something that had been entrusted to Mr. Shultz, and as if that right had been delegated by the Palestinians to the Secretary of State of the United States so that he might decide on it on their behalf.

76. As for serving Israel's interests by permitting it to expand on the pretext of achieving security through an imposed American-Israeli peace, Mr. Shultz—forgetting that it is the security of the Arab States that is threatened by the United States arming Israel and providing it with massive assistance—said the following in the same statement: "The bulk of Israel's population lived within artillery range of hostile Arab armies. I am not about to ask Israel to live that way again."* Is that not expansionism? Does that not mean that we should say to Israel before any peace comes about: "Go on, expand, and when you feel you want peace, it will be an expansionist peace in favour of Israel"? If there is any other explanation of that statement, please give it to us.

77. The peace Washington calls for is just another Camp David like the one condemned by the General Assembly, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the Arab summit conferences. Such a peace means rewarding the aggressor while the strategic balance, which is a prerequisite for a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the region, is disturbed. We cannot but wonder about Washington's intentions, as expressed by its Secretary of State in speaking of peace in the Middle East, when he said:

> "Strategic co-operation between the United States and Israel has become a formal, institutionalized process. We have established the Joint Political-Military Group to improve co-operation so that we can resist threats to our common interests in the Middle East. This kind of co-operation has been long overdue. Today, it is an important part of our strategic relationship."*

78. Does not peace together with surrender, separate arrangements, abrogation of the role of the United Nations and the bypassing of its resolutions mean a willingness to create an American strategic alliance with the defeatist Arabs against the militant people of Palestine and against Syria, Lebanon and the steadfast Arab people?

79. The superior and paternalistic outlook of the United States Administration, which behaves towards the Middle East as though the Arab world was created to be a rear staging area for American-Israeli interests, is in keeping with that of the Zionist lobby that controls the politicians in Washington and holds sway over senators and representatives in Congress. Washington, in turn, also controls the lobby through the interaction and give-and-take between the interests of the two sides at a given moment on specific internal or external issues. The Zionist lobby, operating under the aegis of the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), has clearly demonstrated a consistency and harmony of interests, as represented by United States demands for the benefit of Israel and vice versa. The scale of priorities consists of mutual duties and obligations, as set forth in an AIPAC communiqué issued at Washington on 21 April 1985, as follows:

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

"The bonds that link the United States and Israel are secured by a shared commitment to moral and democratic values. These values have been the bedrock of a special relationship that has spanned almost four decades.

"The American-Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) is committed to promoting strong and consistently close relations between our country and Israel. To enhance this relationship, AIPAC's 1985 issue priorities include: maintaining U.S. economic and military assistance to Israel on a grant basis; opposing U.S. sales of sophisticated weapons to Arab countries which consider themselves in a state of war with Israel; promoting direct negotiations between Israel and Arab countries, and urging normalization of diplomatic, trade, cultural, political and other relations between Israel and Arab countries; enhancing the framework for meaningful strategic co-operation moving towards a full political-military alliance between the United States and Israel; implementing a U.S.-Israel free trade area, and transferring the American embassy to Jerusalem, Israel's capital."*

80. All those that beg for separate solutions are begging from a State allied with their enemy. The link between their enemy and that great Power that they delude themselves might be capable of responding to their aspirations is an organic and institutional link in all areas of importance and primarily in that of strategic alliance. They are therefore really begging from their enemy, Israel, and not from a State capable of exercising freedom of choice, endowed with justice and the rule of law and enjoying the necessary objectivity.

81. We call on the Security Council at its current meeting to adopt the following measures. First, it should reaffirm and grant full and effective recognition to the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, above all its right to return, to self-determination and to establish its own independent State in its national homeland. Such recognition has been long delayed without any legal, humanitarian or political justification, since the General Assembly has affirmed those rights in numerous resolutions and they have been endorsed by all the peace-loving peoples of the world. Secondly, the Council should oblige Israel to withdraw forthwith and unconditionally from all Arab and Palestinian occupied territories, in accordance with United Nations resolutions. Thirdly, it should endorse the call for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East made by the General Assembly in its resolution 38/58 C. The Council should urge all parties directly involved in the conflict to take part in that conference under the auspices of the United Nations and with the participation of the United States and the Soviet Union, since such a conference is the internationally accepted way of arriving at a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement of the conflict. Fourthly, should Israel not comply with these just and internationally endorsed demands, we call upon the Council to apply mandatory and comprehensive sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, since Israel has demonstrated continued violation of the Charter's provisions and a failure to be bound by the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

82. I conclude by saying that Arab rights are not a commodity for sale or barter and that we are determined to resist occupation and aggression regardless of how long it takes, how much it costs or what sacrifices we may have to make. In our assiduous striving for a just peace, we shall not abdicate our rights or the rights of our Arab brothers. We should like to stress that those who are obstructing the endeavour for a just peace are those that form alliances with Israel and supply it with weapons, money and support in all fields. Syria is desirous of a just, lasting and comprehensive peace. President Hafez Al-Assad affirmed that desire in a press statement on 30 September, when he said:

"We in Syria have for years raised the flag of peace. We have done everything we could do for peace, our objective being to recover the territories occupied by Israel and to ensure the exercise by the Palestinian people of its legitimate national rights, including its right to self-determination and to the establishment of its own independent State."

83. Our President described the various attempts that are being made as "attempts to divide the Arabs, to weaken them and to make them surrender to Israeli designs". I quote again from what he said:

"Israel does not want the international conference for two reasons: firstly, because it does not want to face the Arabs all together; and secondly, because it does not want to submit to any restrictions or guarantees that might emerge from such a conference, since the guarantees would limit the freedom to expand which it considers essential. Indeed, expansionism is the idealogical basis which serves as Israel's point of departure."

84. Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): Australia, like all Member States, wishes to see a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. For too long this elusive goal has been thwarted either by accident or by design. At times, it has seemed, the difficulties involved have had as much to do with procedure as with substance. Often when goodwill has been evident in some quarters, malevolence has surfaced in others.

85. Australia does not, of course, profess to tell the parties to the conflict how to settle their differences, other than to abide by their responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations. We do not have rigid views on the many proposals which have been advanced for negotiations between the parties. Nor do we exclude a suitably prepared international peace conference as part of the process. What we do believe, quite firmly, is that peace cannot come to the Middle East without a negotiated agreement. Any such agreement, however arrived at, will need to take proper account of the rights and legitimate aspirations and concerns of all peoples of the region.

86. Ultimately, in our view, a comprehensive settlement will prove possible only on the basis of a series of related

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

compromises. These include Israel's withdrawal from occupied Arab territories, the recognition by the States of the region and the PLO of Israel's right to exist and their acceptance of all elements of Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), and the acknowledgement of the right of self-determination for the Palestinian people, including their right, if they so choose, to independence and the possibility of their own independent State. A durable settlement in the Middle East is possible only with the involvement of all interested parties. At the core of the Middle East problem is the future of the Palestinians. In our view, it is necessary to remove the barriers to direct discussions with representatives of the Palestinian people erected by the parties involved.

87. Such changes and compromises will require flexibility; they will require political will; and, we acknowledge, they will not be without their dangers. But a new beginning must be made. The vicious circle of violence and inflexibility must be broken. The alternative of rigidity and continuing animosity will not serve the long-term interests of the countries of the Middle East region, nor indeed of anyone else.

88. In recent months we have had reason to believe that developments might have been heading in a positive, even hopeful, direction, at least partly as a result of the initiative of King Hussein of Jordan. This initiative had seemed to offer the promise of progress. My delegation very much hopes that the recently darkening shadows of terrorism and violence will not be cast permanently over this initiative and the cause of peace.

89. Recent incidents have shown clearly the futility of killing based on vengeance, on retaliation or on the desire to terrorize. Violence by one side has not prevented violence by others but, on the contrary, seems to have engendered it. The hijacking of the *Achille Lauro* in recent days and the Israeli raid on headquarters of the PLO in Tunisia are not isolated incidents of violence. It is obvious, however, that none of these many acts has brought peace to the region or advanced the cause for which the perpetrators claimed to be fighting. Terrorism and violence of the type so prevalent in the Middle East at present can only remain matters of profound concern to the international community and a threat to the peace.

90. At this point, I should like to express my delegation's condolences to the relatives of Mr. Klinghoffer, who is yet another unfortunate and innocent victim of the cycle of violence that is afflicting the Middle East.

91. I must say frankly that the Australian delegation has been concerned about the course of this and other recent debates in the Council. We are concerned for two reasons.

92. First, the standing and potential effectiveness of this Council are being eroded by its misuse as a smaller General Assembly. That is a view that I know is shared by a number of other members of the Council. The Council does not exist simply to provide a forum for countries, however strongly they may feel on a particular subject. It has a particular responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and that responsibility extends to promoting peace. The Council could work in a number of ways towards the achievement of a negotiated settlement in the Middle East, but it can contribute effectively only by adopting a co-operative approach. We have to wonder whether the timing of the current debate will in fact promote the peace we all seek.

93. Secondly, the Council seems to have become increasingly an arena of confrontation rather than a forum for conciliation. A series of statements criticizing one side or the other, blaming one side or the other, often in particularly harsh language, does not in our view advance the cause of peace in the Middle East. My delegation hopes that all statements made in the Council will be constructive and helpful rather than polemical.

94. The Council can play a useful role in this and, indeed, any other dispute only if the world community, acting through the Council, puts aside questions of violence and vengeance and turns instead to calm and conciliation. We hope that the parties most directly involved will also choose that path.

95. Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): A number of highly significant meetings are being held during this month of October. They are part of the great celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. On this occasion, the Security Council finds itself compelled to meet once again to consider a problem whose persistence is proof that the principles of the Charter of the United Nations remain, 40 years later, more an ideal to be attained than a fact of international life. The rule of law, the very idea of co-operation in mutual respect, seem to loom like ambitious Utopias while attitudes heavy with the threat or use of force gain ground over negotiation and agreement. The spirit of conciliation and compromise are undermined by a stubborn spirit of confrontation characterized by a desire to cater to specific interests to the detriment of ethical and legal considerations that are of collective interest and benefit and that form the very basis of the United Nations.

96. The crisis in the Middle East has not substantially changed. Many of the elements that characterize it are prohibited under international law: occupation, *de facto* annexation, a disproportionate and constant recourse to the threat and use of force which, in turn, exacerbates the tragic cycle of terrorism and violence in all its forms—all these things persist.

97. Too much time has already gone by with the international community unable to implement a just, negotiated, comprehensive and lasting solution to this conflict, in spite of the fact that the fundamental principles already exist, as does the framework of norms for such a solution, with which my country is in complete agreement.

98. To fulfil that responsibility I should like briefly to outline Peru's position on the question now before us.

99. The first element on which my country's position is based is the categorical affirmation that everything relating to Palestine is an essential part of the problem of the Middle East, and that it is thus impossible to envisage any solution that does not correctly take into account the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

100. Secondly, we believe that the recognition and exercise of those rights inevitably includes respect for the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people and for their establishment as an independent State, without which there can be no final solution to the crisis in the region.

101. A third fundamental criterion and norm is that any solution reached must ensure the right of all States to exist within secure and internationally recognized borders. In that context my country considers it impossible to establish a just and lasting peace in the Middle East without Israel's withdrawal from all the territories occupied since 1967.

102. Lastly, Peru supports the convening of an international conference on the Middle East with the participation of all parties concerned as an appropriate framework within which to arrive at a comprehensive solution.

103. The task before the members of the Council who are in a position to have a positive influence and before the entire international community is enormous and complex. It takes imagination to combine all those elements I have mentioned into a plan, within an acceptable time-frame, that can, by resolving the problem presented by this focal point of acute tension and violence, definitively lift this moral burden that the situation in the Middle East represents for the Organization. Clearly, this will require of us more than good intentions. It will require perseverance and political will to give a definitive impetus to a solution that can encompass, in so far as possible, all the values, principles and interests at stake in that strife-torn region.

104. But in that process we must never lose sight of the original commitment made by the international community, commitment which almost 40 years later remains unfulfilled, nor should we forget for a single moment that it is in that original non-fulfilment of a commitment that the ultimate crux of the problem resides.

105. Because in this, as in the other problems confronting our Organization, the fundamental element is the reestablishment of justice. On this occasion, when we should rise above almost 40 years of endless acts of violence and passion to recover that original perspective, and with it the essence of the problem, we must be more than ever aware that we can accomplish nothing if we do not reestablish that rule of justice *vis-à-vis* the Palestinian people, justice *vis-à-vis* the truth, justice *vis-à-vis* this Organization and justice *vis-à-vis* history.

106. When we have achieved that, all the other elements will fall into place because the ethical, political, historical foundations of life will have been restored and there will be secure and recognized borders, there will be peace, security for all and, harmonious coexistence for all States and peoples throughout the Middle East.

107. My delegation once again commits its total dedication and resolve to the attainment of that peace, the precondition for which is justice and which, after 40 years, requires that we now correct the mistakes, the selfishness, and the arbitrariness that led us to this tragedy, in order to begin, without preconditions or attempts to exclude anyone, the process of a final solution with guarantees and rights for all.

108. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): Sir, it was gratifying that yesterday [*2618th meeting*] the Council, under your presidency, unanimously agreed on a statement read out by you condemning all acts of terrorism. My delegation fully endorses and welcomes that statement in all its aspects.

109. On this occasion my delegation fully supports the request to convene this meeting in order to consider the Middle East problem, including the Palestinian question, and is gratified at being given the opportunity to reaffirm its position on this important item.

110. It has been almost four decades that the problem in the Middle East has remained unresolved, despite intensive efforts undertaken by the United Nations and individual Member States. The past nine months have witnessed a deterioration in the situation resulting in further acts of aggression and violence. There can be no doubt that the core issue that has generated the problem and the deterioration of the situation in the Middle East is the question of Palestine. It is also evident that without a settlement of the Palestinian question the cycles of violence, as illustrated most recently by the shocking *Achille Lauro* incident, will continue unabated and may, indeed, worsen.

111. My delegation considers the issue before the Council to be one of the most crucial issues confronting the international community by virtue of the strategic importance of the Middle East and the fact that peace, security and stability cannot be established in the area without resolving the question of Palestine, the root cause of the conflict. That question is not only central to international peace and security but is also a question of human freedom and dignity. It is therefore important to find an early solution to this conflict, which has brought untold suffering and misery to millions of people—in particular to the Palestinian people, who have been unjustly denied their basic and inherent rights to self-determination and nationhood.

112. The General Assembly has time and again endorsed the inalienable rights of the Palestinians, including the right to return to their homes, the right to self-determination and the right to establish their own State. The Security Council has adopted resolution 242 (1967), which remains the agreed basis for achieving a lasting peace in the Middle East. It later adopted resolution 338 (1973), which calls for the implementation of resolution

242 (1967) by the parties concerned. Those resolutions have not, however, been implemented.

113. The position of the Royal Thai Government has been consistent and steadfast in supporting the rights of the Palestinian people. In a message addressed to the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian people, on 29 November 1984, General Prem Tinsulanonda, Prime Minister of Thailand, stated:

> "May I, on behalf of the Government and people of Thailand, extend to you and, through you, to the Palestinian people our solidarity with its just struggle to obtain its legitimate rights of self-determination and a homeland.
>
> "For more than three decades the Palestinians were uprooted from their homeland and deprived of their rights to self-determination, as well as other basic human rights. In this regard we fully sympathize with their anguish. Not only must every effort be made to provide them with urgent and continuous humanitarian relief, but their legitimate and inalienable right to self-determination without external interference, including the right to national independence and sovereignty and the right to return to their homes and properties must also be restored to them"[3]

114. I therefore wish on behalf of the delegation of Thailand to reiterate its support for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, represented by the PLO, including the right to statehood, as well as the right of all States in the region, including Israel, to exist within secure and recognized boundaries.

115. Developments in the Middle East during the past 38 years have given clear emphasis to the need for concerted international action under the auspices of the United Nations with a view to evolving a just, viable, comprehensive and lasting solution to the Middle East problem. It is Thailand's belief that the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, as called for by the Geneva Declaration[4] and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights,[5] adopted by the International Conference on the question of Palestine, held at Geneva in 1983 and endorsed by the General Assembly in resolutions 38/58 C of 13 December 1983 and 39/49 D of 11 December 1984, would further advance the prospects for peace in the region. My delegation therefore attaches great importance to the early convening of such a conference.

116. My delegation would like to take this opportunity to place on record its deep appreciation to the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, under the competent and able leadership of Mr. Massamba Sarré of Senegal and to the Secretary-General for their untiring efforts in enhancing international awareness and support in this regard.

117. It is the earnest hope of my delegation that, during the year of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, more determined efforts will be exerted by all parties concerned to resolve the question of Palestine on the basis of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and relevant United Nations resolutions with a view to restoring peace in the Middle East.

118. It remains our hope and belief that a durable solution to the conflict in the Middle East, with the question of Palestine as its core issue, can be found through a peaceful and negotiated settlement based on the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from all the territories occupied since 1967 and on the recognition of the rights of the Palestinians as well as of all States in the region.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

NOTES

[1] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fortieth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 16th meeting, para. 167.

[3] A/AC.183/PV.109, pp. 58-60.

[4] United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83. I. 21, chap. I, sect. A.

[5] *Ibid.*, chap. I, sect. B.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61439—March 1995—1,9